
Remarks/Arguments

The numbered paragraphs of the office action are responded to through the corresponding numbered paragraphs below. The applicant has addressed each issue in turn and, for clarity, has provided a heading for each issue.

Continued Examination Under – 35 CFR 1.114

1. The Examiner provided a response for the request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114. The applicant believes that no response is required for this paragraph.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

2. The Examiner provided the citation to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) "which form the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action." The applicant believes that no response is required for this paragraph.

3. The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11, 13, 17–19, 21, 22, 24, 25, 28, 29 and 31 "under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated over Laurent (US 6,378,888) in view of Bumgarner (US 5,809,907) and Boisch (US 6,729,828)." The inventor has signed an affidavit declaring an invention date before January 5, 2001. The references of Laurent (US 6,378,888) and Boisch (US 6,729,828) are invalid references under 35 U.S.C 103(a) because the invention date is before the filing dates of both patents. Since claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11, 13, 17–19, 21, 22, 24, 25, 28, 29 and 31 were all rejected

based on the Laurent (US 6,378,888) and Boisch (US 6,729,828) patents, the applicant

believes that this response is fully responsive to the rejection of this paragraph.

Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of this paragraph.

4. The Examiner rejected claims 2, 8, 20 and 26 "under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Laurent (US 6,378,888) in view of Bumgarner (US 5,809,907), Boisch (US 6,729,828), and further in view of Haggard (US 2,870,928)." As noted above, the inventor has signed an affidavit declaring an invention date before January 5, 2001. The references of Laurent (US 6,378,888) and Boisch (US 6,729,828) are invalid references under 35 U.S.C 103(a) because the invention date is before the filing dates of both patents. Since claims 2, 8, 20 and 26 were all rejected based on the Laurent (US 6,378,888) and Boisch (US 6,729,828) patents, the applicant believes that this response is fully responsive to the rejection of this paragraph. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of this paragraph.

5. The Examiner rejected claims 5 and 23 "under 36 U.S.C. 103(a) "as being unpatentable over Laurent (US 6,378,888) in view of Bumgarner (US 5,809,907), Boisch (US 6,729,828 and further in view Banks (GB 2,169,248)." As noted above, the inventor has signed an affidavit declaring an invention date before January 5, 2001. The

references of Laurent (US 6,378,888) and Boisch (US 6,729,828) are invalid references under 35 U.S.C 103(a) because the invention date is before the filing dates of both patents. Since claims 5 and 23 were both rejected based on the Laurent (US 6,378,888) and Boisch (US 6,729,828) patents, the applicant believes that this response is fully responsive to the rejection of this paragraph. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of this paragraph.

6. The Examiner rejected claims 9 and 27 "under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Laurent (US 6,378,888) in view of Bumgarner (US 5,809,907), Boisch (US 6,729,828), and further in view of van der Lely (US 4,362,340)." As noted above, the inventor has signed an affidavit declaring an invention date before January 5, 2001. The references of Laurent (US 6,378,888) and Boisch (US 6,729,828) are invalid references under 35 U.S.C 103(a) because the invention date is before the filing dates of both patents. Since claims 9 and 27 were both rejected based on the Laurent (US 6,378,888) and Boisch (US 6,729,828) patents, the applicant believes that this response is fully responsive to the rejection of this paragraph. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of this paragraph.

7. The Examiner rejected claims 12, 14, 30 and 32 "under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Laurent (US 6,378,888) in view of Bumgarner (US 5,809,907), Boisch

(US 6,729,828), and further in view of Bombardier (US 3,149,738).")." As noted above, the inventor has signed an affidavit declaring an invention date before January 5, 2001.

The references of Laurent (US 6,378,888) and Boisch (US 6,729,828) are invalid references under 35 U.S.C 103(a) because the invention date is before the filing dates of both patents. Since claims 12, 14, 30, and 32 were all rejected based on the Laurent (US 6,378,888) and Boisch (US 6,729,828) patents, the applicant believes that this response is fully responsive to the rejection of this paragraph. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of this paragraph.

8. The Examiner rejected claims 15 and 33 "under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Laurent (US 6,378,888) in view of Bumgarner (US 5,809,907), Boisch (US 6,729,828), and further in view of Good (US 4,890,560)." As noted above, the inventor has signed an affidavit declaring an invention date before January 5, 2001. The references of Laurent (US 6,378,888) and Boisch (US 6,729,828) are invalid references under 35 U.S.C 103(a) because the invention date is before the filing dates of both patents. Since claims 15 and 33 were both rejected based on the Laurent (US 6,378,888) and Boisch (US 6,729,828) patents, the applicant believes that this response is fully responsive to the rejection of this paragraph. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of this paragraph.

9. The Examiner rejected claims 16 and 34 "under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Laurent (US 6,378,888) in view of Bumgarner (US 5,809,907), and Boisch (US 6,729,828)." As noted above, the inventor has signed an affidavit declaring an invention date before January 5, 2001. The references of Laurent (US 6,378,888) and Boisch (US 6,729,828) are invalid references under 35 U.S.C 103(a) because the invention date is before the filing dates of both patents. Since claims 16 and 34 were both rejected based on the Laurent (US 6,378,888) and Boisch (US 6,729,828) patents, the applicant believes that this response is fully responsive to the rejection of this paragraph. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of this paragraph.

Conclusion

10. The Examiner indicated that the "Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection;" and stated that the "applicant's arguments field 2/21/06 have been fully considered but are not persuasive." The applicant appreciates the Examiner's review and respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of all rejected claims based on the above responses.

11. The Examiner agreed that a skid may have wheels but is not required to have wheels. The applicant believes that no response is required for this paragraph.

12. The Examiner provided information concerning communication on this case. The Applicant appreciates the Examiner's willingness to discuss this case but believes that no specific response to this paragraph is required.

13. The Examiner provided information concerning communication to the Examiner's Supervisor if the Examiner could not be reached. The Applicant appreciates the Examiner's Supervisor and her willingness to discuss this case but believes that no specific response to this paragraph is required.

14. The Examiner provided information concerning the status of the application of this case in the PAIR system. The Applicant appreciates the Examiner's information, but believes that no specific response to this paragraph is required.

The Inventor has sworn behind the references of Laurent (US 6,378,888) and Boisch (US 6,729,828). In view of the foregoing, and in summary, applicant believes that all issues and points of the Examiner's Office Action have been addressed. Applicant believes that the presently presented claims (claims 1-34) are patentable over the prior art.


App. S/N: 10/645,390
Filing Date: 08/21/2003
Amdt Date: 08/08/06

RESPONSE TO
OFFICE ACTION

Examiner M. Scott Lowe
Group Art Unit: 3652
Confirm. No.8098

Reconsideration and allowance of this application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted this 8 day of August, 2006.



Douglas M. Grover, Reg. No. 52,974
3816 West El Paso Street
Broken Arrow, Oklahoma 74012
Telephone: 918-645-4509
Facsimile: 918-461-2051



App. S/N: 10/645,390
Filing Date: 08/21/2003
Amdt Date: 08/08/06

RESPONSE TO
OFFICE ACTION

Examiner M. Scott Lowe
Group Art Unit: 3652
Confirm. No.8098

Index

Certificate of Mailing.....	1
Cover Letter.....	2
Response to Office Action	3
Remarks/Arguments.....	4
Conclusion	8